

Russell L. Johnson (SBN 053833)
rljohnson@sidley.com
 Peter H. Kang (SBN 158101)
pkang@sidley.com
 Teague I. Donahey (SBN 197531)
tdonahey@sidley.com
 Sidley Austin LLP
 555 California Street
 San Francisco, California 94104
 Telephone: (415) 772-1200
 Facsimile: (415) 772-7400

Attorneys for Plaintiff
 AMKOR TECHNOLOGY, INC.

William J. Bohler (SBN 141970)
wjbohler@comcast.net
 LAW OFFICE OF WILLIAM BOHLER
 8043 Rockford Place
 Pleasanton, California 94566
 Telephone: (650) 218-6652
 Facsimile: (925) 846-3914

Attorneys for Defendants
 CARSEM (M) SDN BHD, CARSEM SEMICONDUCTOR SDN BHD, and CARSEM INC.,



United States District Court
 Northern District of California
 San Francisco Division

AMKOR TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CARSEM (M) SDN BHD, CARSEM
 SEMICONDUCTOR SDN BHD, and
 CARSEM INC.,

Defendants.

No. C 03-5116 VRW (filed Nov. 18, 2003)

**TWELFTH JOINT STATUS REPORT
 CONCERNING STAY OF PROCEEDINGS**

Pursuant to the Court's request, *see* Docket No. 41 (June 25, 2010), the parties hereby submit this Twelfth Joint Status Report Concerning Stay of Proceedings. The parties are continuing to

1 litigate their dispute before the U.S. International Trade Commission (“ITC”) in the investigation
2 styled *In the Matter of Certain Encapsulated Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing*
3 *Same*, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-501. The Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) issued an Initial
4 Determination (“ID”) on November 18, 2004. Thereafter, on February 1, 2005, the ITC decided to
5 review the ALJ’s ID. The ITC modified the ALJ’s claim construction regarding certain terms and
6 remanded the investigation back to the ALJ for further findings in light of these changes. On
7 November 9, 2005, the ALJ issued a second ID. On July 1, 2009, the ITC again remanded this
8 investigation to the ALJ. A further evidentiary hearing was held before the ALJ on September 10
9 and 11, 2009, and a third ID was issued on October 30, 2009. On December 16, 2009, the ITC
10 determined that it would review the third ID in its entirety and requested additional briefing from the
11 parties. On February 18, 2010, the ITC reversed the third ID and remanded this investigation to the
12 ALJ to make findings on the issues of anticipation and obviousness in light of prior art
13 determinations by the Commission. On March 22, 2010, the ALJ issued a fourth ID, which is under
14 review by the Commission. The target date for completion of this investigation is July 20, 2010.

15 Therefore, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659, the parties respectfully request that the Stay Order
16 remain in effect until the determination of the Commission in the ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-501 becomes
17 final, including any appeals pursuant to the decision in *In re Princo Corp.*, 478 F.3d 1345, *reh. den.*,
18 486 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

1 Pursuant to General Order 45.X.B, Plaintiff obtained concurrence in the filing of this
2 document from counsel for Defendants, as listed below.

3
4 Dated: July 15, 2010

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

5
6 By: /s/ Peter H. Kang

7 Peter H. Kang
8 Attorneys For Plaintiff
Amkor Technology, Inc.

9 Dated: July 15, 2010

LAW OFFICE OF WILLIAM BOHLER

10
11 By: /s/ William J. Bohler

12 William J. Bohler
13 Attorneys For Defendants
14 Carsem (M) Sdn Bhd, Carsem Semiconductor
Sdn Bhd, and Carsem Inc.